DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 423 CS 206 632

TITLE Present and Future Directions in English Education Research.
INSTITUTION National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Ill.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 85p.: Papers presented at a workshop during the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (71st, Boston, MA, November 20-25, 1981). Several papers may be marginally legible due to broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *English Instruction; Evaluation Criteria; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Humanities Instruction; *Language Acquisition; Linguistics; Oral Language; Reading Instruction; *Reading Processes; *Research Opportunities; Student Characteristics; Writing Instruction; *Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS Reading Writing Relationship

ABSTRACT

The 12 papers in this collection deal with trends in English education research. The papers discuss the following topics: (1) language awareness and schooling, (2) the language processes underlying literacy, (3) the role of oral language in early writing processes, (4) writing to learn in the humanities, (5) instructional effect on reading development, (6) the development of metaphor comprehension, (7) the relationship between reading and writing, (8) evaluating the writing course, (9) student characteristics and writing performance, (10) interrupting visual feedback in writing, (11) the development of preschoolers' discourse skills in a dyadic context, and (12) teachers' use of language as a way of learning. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208423

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PRESENT AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION RESEARCH

National Council of Teachers of English

Boston, Massachusetts

November 23-24, 1981

Sponsored by
Standing Committee on Research, NCTE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Council of
Teachers of English
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS206632

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PRESENT AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION RESEARCH
Schedule

November 23

8:30 Welcome and Introductory Remarks, C. R. Kline, Jr. and K. J. Kantor presiding

8:45-11:00 Language Development and the Acquisition of Literacy

Consultant: Prof. Rita Brause, Fordham University

Papers:

Diane V. Bewell and Stanley B. Straw, "Language Awareness and Schooling: What Do Children Know About the Language They Use in School?"

Mary Epes, Carolyn Kirkpatrick, and Michael Southwell, "Towards a Model of Language Processes Underlying Literacy."

Ann Bayer, "Teachers Talking to Learn."

11:00-1:00 LUNCH

1:00-4:00 Language Development and the Role of Talk as a Foundation for Linguistic Growth

Consultant: Prof. John Mayher, New York University

Papers:

Anne Haas Dyson, "The Role of Oral Language in Early Writing Processes."

Anthony Pelligrini, "The Development of Preschoolers' Discourse Skills in a Dyadic Context."

Anne Ruggles Gere, "Writing to Learn in the Humanities."

4:00-5:00 Discussion

November 24

9:00-11:00 Reading Growth and Development

Consultant: Prof. Rob Tierney, University of Illinois

Papers:

Diane E. DeFord, "Instructional Effect on Reading Development."

Lee Galda, "The Development of the Comprehension of Metaphor."

Sandra Stotsky, "A Review of Research on the Relationship Between Reading and Writing: Directions for Future Research."

11:00-11:45 Discussion

11:45-1:00 LUNCH

1:00-3:30 Writing Growth and Development

Consultant: Prof. William Smith, University of Pittsburgh

Papers:

Stephen P. Witte, "Toward a Model for Writing Course Evaluation."

Sarah W. Freeman, "Student Characteristics and Writing Performance."

Glynda Hull, Deborah Arnowitz, and William Smith, "Interrupting Visual Feedback in Writing."

3:30-4:00 Discussion

4:00-4:30 Summing Up--Where have we been? Where are we? Where may we go?

Consultants: Prof. A. Applebee, Stanford University
Prof. Anthony Petrosky (Ch. Standing Committee on Research), University of Pittsburgh

There will be a coffee break in each morning and each afternoon session.

Members of the Subcommittee Directing Workshop

Arthur N. Applebee (Ph.D., University of London)
Associate Professor, Stanford University, School of Education, Stanford, California.
Mr. Applebee's major publications include Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English, A Child's Concept of Story, and Writing in the Secondary School.

Rita S. Brause (Ed.D., New York University)
Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, Fordham University, New York, New York.
Ms. Brause is a Visiting Scholar this year at Harvard University. Her present research includes an NIE funded ethnographic study of children's comprehension of teacher directives in three bilingual classrooms. She is interested in the relationship between linguistic theory as it informs and is informed by psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic issues, particularly as they are related to educational concerns including cognitive development, linguistic competence, and communicative competence evidenced in spoken and written language modes.

James L. Collins (Ed.D., University of Massachusetts at Amherst)
Assistant Professor, Department of Instruction, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.
Mr. Collins has investigated developmental and instructional relationships between talking and writing. He is presently studying the development of referential adequacy in student writing.

Kenneth J. Kantor (Ph.D., Stanford University)
Associate Professor, Department of Language Education, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.
Coordinator of the Research in Composition Network (RCN) and editor of the RCN Newsletter, Mr. Kantor is Associate Editor of Research in the Teaching of English. Kantor has published in Language Arts, English Journal, English Education, and Research in the Teaching of English; his special interests include the theory and history of curriculum and research in composition.

Charles R. Kline, Jr. (Ph.D., University of North Carolina)
Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Mr. Kline's present work includes a documentary study of the influence of Greek rhetoric on Christian faith as evidenced in the New Testament and a study of the later evoked responses in the cortical and subcortical structures of the brain.

John S. Mayher (Ed.D., Harvard University)
Visiting Associate Professor, Department of English, The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
Mr. Mayher's present work includes directing the Learning to Write/Writing to Learn Outreach Program of the University of Arizona which is designed to help the secondary school teachers of Arizona improve the teaching of writing both in English classes and across the curriculum.

Anthony Petrosky (Ph.D., SUNY-Buffalo)

Associate Professor of English Education, University of Pittsburgh
Author, poet, publisher, Mr. Petrosky is Chairman of the Standing Committee on Research, NCTE.

William L. Smith (Ph.D., Florida State University)

Associate Professor of English and Director of the University Writing Workshop, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Professor Smith's research has focussed on written composition at various grade levels, examining students' ability to manipulate syntactic structures, the effects of audience specification and other cuesm and variables affecting syntax, error, and quality. His publications have appeared in such journals as Research in the Teaching of English, English Journal, and Journal of Experimental Education.

Rob Tierney (Ph.D., University of Georgia)

Associate Professor, College of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Dr. Tierney's present work includes research on learning how to learn from text and several studies examining reading comprehension from the perspective of planned based analyses of author's intentions.

Diane V. Bewell
Stanley B. Straw

Language Awareness and Schooling: What Do Children Know About the Language They Use in School?

The purpose of this study was to gather data concerning the nature and development of young children's language concepts and how that is related to common syntactic patterns, educational experience, and sex.

Previous research findings indicate that young children do not often understand or use the terminology employed in instruction, such as "word", "print" or "letter". Researchers have also found a relationship between knowledge or awareness of terminology and the ability to use language, particularly in a reading context. Research results on awareness of syntactic structures indicates that as children become older, their awareness of form classes and form class use become greater and is significantly related to their ability to use words effectively in different syntactic situations. Results have further indicated that young children show little awareness of the lexical identity of words, and as they grow older and gain greater educational experience, they exhibit awareness of and control over the syntactic structures they hear and produce.

Writers have suggested that language awareness is highly related to cognitive development and, thereby, related to language learning. Bewell and Straw (1981) have drawn the following overall conclusion from their review of the literature in language awareness:

"There is strong evidence to suggest that a relationship exists between the development of metalinguistic awareness and language learning. It seems that readiness for beginning reading instruction is related to a certain level of metalinguistic awareness, which, in turn, seems to reflect cognitive development. . .If the teacher in structuring instructional activities is aware of the implications of the concept of metalinguistic awareness, then it would seem that both cognitive and linguistic growth could be facilitated, leading to increased ability or performance in language arts." (p. 118).

The present study investigated children's responses to a spoken word boundary identification task; children were assessed on their ability to identify a word as a separate unit in speech and their performance was analyzed according to sex, educational experience, and the type of syntactic structures used. A quantitative analysis indicated that between children in nursery school, kindergarten, and grade one, ability to identify words was significantly different. Grade one students demonstrated an almost adult-like performance on all but one syntactic structure; kindergarten students demonstrated a more adult-like performance than nursery school children. When the data were analyzed by sex, it became apparent that girls performed better (that is, more adult-like) than boys only at the kindergarten level.

Different syntactic structures seemed to affect performance of all students. Seven sentence patterns observable in all subjects' spontaneous speech were presented to the students in the task. After analysis, the data indicated that one syntactic structure (Noun-Auxiliary-Verb) seemed to be perceived in an adult-like manner by nearly all subjects. An analysis of how subjects groups words into unit followed: every possible combination of units was investigated and the most frequently used were studied.

The final conclusions of the study were: (1) Nursery school and kindergarten students do not have an adult-like concept of spoken word boundaries, but, by the time children have experiences one year of formal schooling, they have developed an adult-like concept of the discrete nature of monosyllabic words; (2)There is a growth in the adult-like concept of spoken word boundaries from nursery school to kindergarten to grade one. Some growth soccurs prior to the introduction of reading instruction. (3) Boys and girls differ from one another in their concepts of spoken word boundaries only at the kindergarten level. (4) A growing sense of "wordness" seems to cause kindergarten and grade one children to classify the bound morpheme ing as a word. (5) Young children do not seem to perceive articles as being discrete words. (6) Young children frequently do not percieve prepositions as being discrete words. (7) The syntactic pattern, noun/auxilliary/monsyllabic main verb, seems to be perceived in an adult-like

manner earlier than any of the other syntactic patterns investigated.

Implications for the classroom might include: (1) Teachers need to become aware that many children who have completed kindergarten do not have an adult-like concept of spoken word boundaries, and that initial reading instruction that does not take this into account may place an obstacle in the child's way to successful reading achievement. (2) Knowledge about word boundary identification achievement of a child may aid a teacher in evaluating the language development of the child. (3) Writers and publishers of materials for beginning reading instruction should be made aware of the eas with which children process certain syntactic patterns and the difficulty with which they process others; this knowledge could be used to develop psycholinguistically sound instructional materials. (4) Reading readiness activities which encourage the development of awareness of spoken word boundaries should be designed and incorporated into beginning reading programs.

The concept of metalinguistic awareness in young children is new, and at time, confusing. It seems that language learning and cognitive development are closely related, but the exact nature of that relationship is unclear. One of the ways in which the two may be related is through the construct of metalinguistic awareness. If this is the case, then additional research needs to be done so that the construct can be clearly identified and instructional methods developed for incorporating the development of instruction in metalinguistic awareness into the goals of a complete language arts curriculum.

The present study has indicated how children perceive words in the stream of speech in certain linguistic contexts and traced the growth of children's perceptions of words in speech in those contexts over the three years from nursery school to grade one. The conclusions shed some light on how children group language and respond to the spoken language they are exposed to and are obliged to process in school.

Bibliography

Begy, G.L. and Cahill, K. The ability of kindergarten children having completed a modified rebus reading program to segment oral language into words. Reading World, (1978), 27-32.

Bewell, D.V. and Straw, S.B. Metalinguistic awareness, cognitive development and language learning. In V. Froese and S.B. Straw (eds), Research in the Language Arts: Language and Schooling. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1981.

Braun, C. and Neilson, A.R. Braun-Neilson Pre-reading Inventory. Scarborough, Ont.: Ginn and Co., 1979.

Cazden, C.B. Play with language and metalinguistic awareness: One dimension of language experience. OMEP (1974), 12-24.

Downing, J. How children think about reading. The Reading Teacher, 23 (1969) 217-230.

Downing, J. Children's concepts of language in learning to read. Educational Research, 12 (1970) 106-112.

Downing, J. The development of linguistic concepts in children's thinking. Research in the Teaching of English, 4 (1971) 5-19.

Downing, J. and Oliver, P. The child's conception of a word. Reading Research Quarterly, 9 (1973-74) 568-582.

Ehri, L.C. Word consciousness in readers and prereaders. Journal of Educational Psychology, 67 (1975) 204-212.

Ehri, L.C. Linguistic insight: Threshold of reading acquisition. In T.G. Waller and G.E. MacKinnon (eds), Reading Research: Advances in Theory and Practice. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Evans, M.C. Children's ability to segment sentences into individual words. In G.H. McNinch and W.D. Miller (eds) Reading: Convention and Inquiry, 24th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 1975.

Francis, H. Children's experience of reading and notions of unit in language. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 43 (1973) 17-23.

Holden, M.H. and MacGinitie, W.H. Children's conceptions of word boundaries in speech and print. Journal of Educational Psychology, 63 (1972) 551-557.

Johns, J.L. Metalinguistic awareness: Its growth and relationship to reading achievement. Paper presented at the 24th Annual Convention of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April 25, 1979.

Kail, M. and Segui, J. Developmental production of utterances from a series of lexemes. Child Language, 5 (1976) 251-260.

Reid, J.F. Learning to think about reading. Educational Research, 9 (1966) 56-62.

Ryan, E.B. Metalinguistic development and reading. In Language Awareness and Reading, Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1980, 38-59.

Ryan, E.B., McNamara, S.R., and Kenney, M. Linguistic awareness and reading performance among beginning readers. Journal of Reading Behavior, 9, (1977) 399-400.

Mary Epes
Carolyn Kirkpatrick
Michael Southwell

TOWARDS A MODEL OF LANGUAGE PROCESSES UNDERLYING LITERACY

No research can as yet satisfactorily explain the phenomenon of the basic writer. It is baffling that young adults, who have passed through twelve years of schooling, can arrive in college manifesting such gross difficulties with the written language. And error persists as a disabling problem for these students, even after they have completed several college writing courses. To understand the persistence of error and to make current basic writing pedagogies more effective, we need a clearer understanding of the relationship of dialect (spoken language) to grapholect (standard written English).

Psycholinguists have developed models of the reading process which help explain this relationship. As they point out, the written language is a visual code for representing meaning, a code which essentially depends upon the spoken language, but is not identical to it. The process of reading includes both decoding (translating written symbols into language) and comprehension (translating written symbols into meaning). But only developing readers give conscious attention to decoding--that is, to the process of translating written symbols into words. For practiced readers, written English--although alphabetic--soon becomes ideographic; words are grasped as wholes, and do not need to be sounded out. Practiced readers attend directly to meaning, and are only subliminally aware of code.

The decoding/comprehension distinction helps clarify the parallel distinction in the writing process between composing (controlling meaning in writing) and encoding (controlling the visual symbols which represent meaning on the page). Just as developing readers' weaknesses in decoding interfere with comprehension, developing writers' weaknesses in encoding

hamper them in the expression of meaning. And writing seems to place even heavier demands on learners than reading does. As beginning readers develop receptive competence in the written language, their main task is learning to subsume forms to meaning. But as beginning writers develop productive competence, they must be actively involved with both forms and meanings. Because they are still wrestling with orthographic conventions, they often subvert the priority of meaning over code. Attending to encoding problems in the midst of composing, they can lose track of their meaning and produce syntactic snarls. It is ironic, however, that when reading their own writing, they often read from the meanings in their heads and so do not even notice their deviations from the grapholect. This can make it extremely difficult for them to edit their writing for correctness.

The most acute problems with the orthographic system among developing writers are those of speakers of nonstandard dialects. Studies in ESL and in children's language acquisition help explain why, by directing attention to the profoundly significant distinction between acquired and learned language systems. One's native spoken language is an acquired system; competence in its lexical, syntactic, and phonological rules is not the result of instruction, but of spontaneous acquisition. However, the written language is a learned system; it is only through explicit instruction and conscious practice that one masters the orthographic conventions by which meaning is represented in visual symbols on the page. When any aspect of the acquired system is in conflict with the system being learned, students must not only learn a new way of representing meaning, but must also unlearn aspects of the first system. To compound the problem, that which they must unlearn is held unconsciously. This makes developing control over the

grapholect especially difficult for basic writing students, virtually all of whom speak some nonstandard dialect of English--perhaps BEV or a dialect influenced by a foreign language. The differences between the system they have acquired and the system they are learning are much greater for them than for speakers of standard dialect, particularly in the case of syntactic rules.

From these understandings we have developed models of the relationship between speech and writing as it obtains for both practiced and unpracticed writers, especially for learners who speak nonstandard dialects. These models illuminate sources of error in students' papers and suggest that basic writing pedagogies will become more effective when they take into account the relationship between dialect and grapholect. Besides implications for fruitful pedagogical experimentation, the insights derived from our developing models may be able to give clearer direction to two bodies of research bearing on writing development: (1) studies of the influence of nonstandard dialect on writing, and (2) error analysis in writing.

BASIC WRITING TEXTS

The following papers by basic writing students illustrate: (1) the difference between composing problems and encoding problems, and (2) the difference between two major sources of encoding problems, unfamiliarity with the print code and the influence of nonstandard dialect.

TEXT # 1

This paper has few encoding errors, but suggests that the writer has severe problems with composing.

I think bringing back the death penalty would reduce the murder rate in New York City. If a person knows he will be severely punished for committing a crime he will be quite hesitant to commit a crime. The death penalty would reduce the numbers of murders per year in New York City because the desire to live is extremely strong. The death penalty would let people know that the justice system deals severely with persons who commit serious crimes.

If a person knows he is going to be harshly punished for doing something wrong he will think about the harsh punishment he will get if he does something that is wrong. Thinking about severe reprimandment is a very discouraging factor.

The death penalty would discourage people from committing murders because the desire of a human being to live is very intense. When someone knows he will be killed for committing a murder he will be very scared and hesitant to commit a murder.

Potential murderers would know the law deals severely with people who commit serious crimes such as muder if the death penalty was brought back. The presence of a strict disciplinary organization greatly discourages people from doing wrongful acts. The use of harsh rules is a good way to prevent people from hurting each other.

TEXT # 2

This paper reflects strong composing skills, but serious problems with encoding. All of its many encoding errors are deviations from print-code conventions. It contains no errors in standard written English which can be traced to the writer's nonstandard dialect.

Growing up in South Carolina was verry happy but it also had its sad points. I was born in the rural area of south carolina. We were 12 in our family. Mother and dad worked share crops with a rich man whose name was Marsh. My early childhood was spent chasing pigs, chickens and cows. I enjoyed watching my older sisters milk cows and feed the pigs. I loved running through the clover covered fields and fields of wild flowers. I also liked playing in the rain, it was so much fun I would jump from one mud pudle to another and feel the mud between my toes. Cold days were spent sitting in the Kitchen neer the woodburning stove. Mother all ways had something cooking are baking. My world was small but happy and beautiful.

I will never forget the day my beautiful world ended. Mother washed for the Marsh famely, she had two baskets of laundry, she carred one on top of her head and I helped with the other. The Marsh famely lived in an old georgian mansion, it reminded me in later years of "Tharrow in gone with the wind." As I approached the house I fealt like Alice in Wonder land. Mother sat me on a milk stool near the back door while she put the laundry away; but my childs curiosty would not lett this opportunity pass without exploring each room, each room that I explored was more impressive then the others. In my little mind I began to compare this house with all its splendor to my house with its torn drapes and broken windows. That day changed my whole life, never again would I see beaute in my world. I was only six years old but I knew what poverty was.

TEXT # 3

In this paper, written by a nonstandard dialect speaker, most of the encoding errors suggest the direct influence of the writer's dialect. Other errors are hypercorrections, arising out of the conflict between her dialect and the grammatical norms of standard written English. In some instances, these encoding problems are compounded by her unfamiliarity with print-code conventions.

A very unsually incident happen one morning while I was driving to work. I made a left turn off Hutchinson parkway onto Tremont Ave. After stopping at the red light a small yellow car was in front. The children was crossing the street on the green light. I stop my car quickly Driving on Tremont Avenue, I drove into the Car Washer. The small yellow car pulled in behind me and stopped to say I had hit it. . . . Being upsetted over him accussing me of hitting his car I was attemped to call the police. To my suprise his car had a dent in the back where the nose of my car hit it. I still was not convened that I hit him. Cooling off a bit I realized that maybe this could have happen at the light.

Discussing my reactions to the incident its seem that I gotten all work up over a small matter. First of all I was upsetted because I didn't realized that I had hit this car. The car was very small compared to my car. The front bumper of my car was higher than his back fender. . . . I shouldn't have had such a reaction as I did. After the driver had follow me to the car washed I should have been more understanding. No one would follow you if somethings had not happen. I will try to be more caution when I see small cars on the highways or streets in front of me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF DIALECT TO GRAPHOLECT

Bartholomae, D. The study of error. College Composition and Communication, 1980, 31, 253-269.

Cazden, C. B. Suggestions from studies of early language acquisition. In J. Destefano & S. Fox (Eds.), Language and the language arts. Boston: Little, Brown, 1974.

Cronnell, B. Black English and spelling. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 81-90.

Epes, M., Kirkpatrick, C., & Southwell, M. G. Investigating error in the writing of nontraditional college students. 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 018).

Gingras, R. C., Ed. Second-language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Washington, D. C. : Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Goodman, K. S. & Buck, C. Dialect barriers to reading comprehension revisited. The Reading Teacher, 1973, 27, 6-12.

Goodman, Y., & Burke, C. Do they read what they speak? The Grade Teacher, 1969, 86, 144-150.

Groff, P. Children's spelling of features of BE. Research in the Teaching of English, 1978, 12, 21-28.

Hartwell, P. Dialect interference in writing: A critical view. Research in the Teaching of English, 1980, 14, 101-118.

Hirsch, E. D. Philosophy of composition. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1977.

Perl, S. Five writers writing: Case studies of the composing processes of unskilled college writers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York Univ., 1978.

Polanyi, M. Personal knowledge. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1958.

Shaughnessy, M. Errors and expectations. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1977.

Smith, F. Understanding reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Smith, F. Psycholinguistics and reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Southwell, M. G., Talburtt, M. A., Kirkpatrick, C., & Epes, M. The effect of systematic grammar instruction on the performance of basic writing students. (In preparation.)

Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and language. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1962

Whiteman, M. Dialect influence and the writing of Black and White working class Americans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown Univ., 1976.

Wolfram, W., & Whiteman, M. The role of dialect interference in composition. Florida FL Reporter, 1971, 9, 34-28, 59.

ABSTRACT

Teachers Talking to Learn

The current literacy crisis reflects the need both for an examination of the language policies and views of language development which underlie literacy instruction, and for alternative models of language development to be proposed as (partial) solutions to literacy problems.

This descriptive study describes and illustrates such an alternative model, one which embodies the notion that language development occurs through meaningful language use. The study also proposes a vehicle for implementing this model in the public schools, through the development of a language policy.

The illustration evolves out of a five year Stanford/San Jose Teacher Corps Project. Two years of completed research and in-service on literacy-related issues provide the background for the study. The illustration documents five teachers, in a small group setting, over a three week period using "talk" as a tool for learning as they set about the task of developing a language policy. The investigator was present as participant-observer in the role of 'instructor'. Five discussion periods were taped. Transcriptions of recorded samples were analyzed by identifying utterances that reflect concept development (learning) and increased use of specialized vocabulary (language growth). Detailed observation notes supplement the recorded data.

Analysis of this material examined the extent to which the language policy the teachers are developing parallels the kinds of learning processes and uses of language engaged by the teachers themselves.

The results of this study raises the issue of implicit English language policies; documents one model of in-service education; and provides information about the role of instructor as collaborator, learning in a small group setting, and natural language development.

Bibliography

Applebee, A. "Writing Across the Curriculum". English Journal, December 1977, pp. 81-85.

_____, The Child's Concept of Story. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

_____, A Study of Writing in the Secondary School. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE 1980.

Barnes, D., J. Britton, and H. Rosen. Language, the Learner and the School. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Papers in Education, 1969.

Barnes, D. From Communication to Curriculum. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1976.

Barnes, D. and F. Todd. Communication and Learning in Small Groups. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Britton, J. Language and Learning. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1970.

Britton, J., et al. The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18. London: MacMillan, Education Ltd. for the Schools Council, 1978.

Bruner, Jerome. Toward A Theory of Instruction. Harvard: Belknap Press, 1967.

Bruner, J., J.J. Goodnow and G.A. Austen. A Study of Thinking. New York: Wiley.

Brunetti, G. "The Bullock Report: Some Implications for American Teachers and Parents", English Journal, November 1968, pp. 58-67.

Bullock, A. A Language for Life. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1975.

Clark, H. and E. Clark. Psychology and Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.

Dixon, J. Growth Through English. London: Nate, 1967.

Donaldson, M. Children's Minds. New York: Norton & Company, 1979.

Edwards, A.D. and V.J. Furlong. The Language of Teaching. London: Heinemann, 1978.

Fillon, B. "Language Across the Curriculum". McGill Journal of Education Winter, 1979, Vol. xiv. No. 1, pp. 47-60.

Flanders, N.A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970

Goodman, K. "Behind the Eye: What Happens in Reading", Theoretical Models and Processes in Reading. Newark, Delaware: IRA, 1976.

Harste J., and C. Burke. "Toward A Socio-Psycholinguistic Model of Reading Comprehension", Viewpoints, Vol. 54, #3, July, 1978.

Hunter, C. and D. Harman. Adult Illiteracy in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979.

Hillerich, R. "Toward An Assessable Definition of Literacy", English Journal, February, 1976, pp. 50-55.

Kelley, G. A Theory of Personality. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1963.

Kolers, P.A. "Reading Is Only Incidentally Visual", Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of Reading. Newark, Delaware: IRA, 1970.

Langer, S. K. Psychological Sketches. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1967.

Marland, M. Language Across the Curriculum. London: Heinemann, 1977.

Martin, N.C., et. al. Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1976.

Mellon, J. National Assessment and the Teaching of English. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1975.

National Association for the Teaching of English. Language Across the Curriculum: Guidelines for Schools. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1976.

Piaget, J. Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood. London: Heinemann, 1951.

_____, Language and Thought of the Child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.

Robinson, Alan. Reading and Writing Instruction in the United States: Historical Trends. IRA, 1977.

Rosen, H. (ed.) Language and Literacy in our Schools. London: University of London Institute of Education, 1975.

Smith, F. Comprehension and Learning: A Conceptual Framework for Teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1975.

_____, Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Torbe, M. Language Policies in Action: Language Across the Curriculum in Some Secondary Schools. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1980.

Tough, J. Talk For Teaching and Learning. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1979.

Vygotsky, L.S. Thought and Language. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Vygotsky, L.S. Mind in Society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Watts, J. (ed.). The Countesthorpe Experience. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1977.

Writing Across the Curriculum Project. From Information to Understanding: From Talking to Writing: Keeping Options Open: Writing in the Humanities: Language and Learning in the Humanities; Language Policies in Schools: Why Write?: Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum: Writing in Science. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1976-77.

Anne Haas Dyson

The Role of Oral Language in Early Writing Processes

Although able users of oral language, most kindergarteners do not yet communicate in conventional written language upon school entry. Their initial attempts to communicate through writing are accompanied by oral language (Britton, 1970; Graves, 1973, 1979; Rosen & Rosen, 1973). King and Rentel (1979, p. 243) suggest that clues to the learning-to-write process may be found in the ways children "traverse the territory between talk and writing." This study explored the role of oral language in early writing processes by intensive examination of selected case study subjects.

The popular belief is that writing develops from an oral language base. Yet, a literature review indicated that oral language (talk) had never been systematically examined as an aspect of the early writing process. How do children use talk in their early attempts at writing? Empirically-based answers to this question should contribute to the forming of both a theoretical framework of writing development (King & Rentel, 1979) and effective teacher strategies for fostering writing growth.

To these ends, participant observation methodology was used to gather data over a three-month period in a self-contained, public school kindergarten. Although all twenty-two members of an intact class were formal participants in the study, five were chosen as case study subjects. These five reflected the classroom's range of different types of child writers.

Six types of data were collected: audio recordings of the children's talk at a classroom writing center, their written products, observational notes, daily log entries, child and parent interviews, and informal assessment tasks.

Analysis of data yielded a categorization of oral language functions during composing, a description of the components of preconventional writing processes, and a narrative description of the writing style of each case study child. The data indicated (a) qualitative differences between preconventional and conventional writing processes, (b) the variability of these early (preconventional) writing processes, depending on the individual child's writing purpose and his/her working knowledge of written language, (c) the influence of the child's general style of functioning on early approaches to writing, and (d) the variable role of oral language, again depending on the individual child's writing purpose and his/her working knowledge of written language.

Based on these findings, inferences were made regarding the process of developing control over written language. These inferences were related to theoretical work on early writing. The process was portrayed as both governed by broad developmental principles and subject to the individual child's style of functioning. Initial writing was described as a form of drawing. Language (talk) may be used to label such writing--to invest it with meaning--but is not the substance of that writing. These first meanings are often labels for people, objects, or events. Eventually, language permeates

the process, providing both meaning (representational function) and the means (directive function) for getting that meaning on paper.

The ultimate goal of the investigation was to contribute developmental information on learning to write. Upon the information provided by this and other studies, curricular decisions may be based. The findings of this study suggested that teachers (a) acknowledge variability in writing purpose and resulting process in both their evaluating and their teaching, (b) carefully observe and participate in young children's early writing, and (c) recognize the "basics" of writing--an understanding of written language's purposes and its fundamental relationship with oral language.

The Role of Oral Language in Early Writing Processes

Bibliography

Britton, J. The student's writing. In E. Evertts (Ed.), Explorations in children's writing. Urbana: NCTE, 1970.

Bussis, A.M., Chittenden, E. A., & Amarel, M. Collaborative research. In S. Madeja (Ed.), The teaching process and the arts and aesthetics (Third Yearbook on Research in Arts and Aesthetic Education). St. Louis, Mo.: CEMREL, 1978.

Clay, M. What did I write? Auckland: Heinemann, 1975.

Donaldson, M. Children's minds. New York: Norton, 1978.

Gardner, H., & Wolf, D. (Eds.). Early symbolization. In W. Damon (ed.-in-Chief). New directions for child development (No. 3) San Francisco: Jessey-Bass, 1979.

Graves, D. Children's writing: Research directions and hypotheses based upon an examination of the writing processes of seven-year-old children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. State University of New York at Buffalo, 1973.

Graves, D. The growth and development of first grade writers. Paper presented at Canadian Council of Teachers of English Annual Meeting, Ottawa, Canada: May 10, 1979.

Kellogg, R. Analyzing children's art. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1970.

King, M. & Rentel, V. Towards a theory of early writing development. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13 (3), 243-255.

McCutcheon, G. On the interpretation of classroom observations. Educational Researcher, 1981, 10 (5), 5-10.

Olsen, D. From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 49 (3), 257-281.

Rosen, C., & Rosen, H. The language of primary school children. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Education, 1973.

Tough, J. The development of meaning. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and language. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1962 (originally published, 1934).

Vygotsky, L. S. Mind and society. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Werner, H. Comparative psychology of mental development. New York: International Universities Press, 1948.

The development of preschoolers' discourse skills in a dyadic context.

The general intent of the study was to examine the development of preschoolers', i.e., 3-5 years old, use of oral language to regulate peer's behavior in a dyadic problem solving context. The research of Piaget (1976) suggests that young children learn best from other children. He noted that in peer interaction contexts, preschoolers' typically egocentric problem solving strategies are challenged by peers. This conflict helps children to decenter their problem solving strategies. That is, they are able to see problems from many points of view, e.g., realizing that a problem may be caused by a number of different factors. Other researchers (e.g., Murray, 1972) have found that preschoolers working in dyads are able to solve problems that children working alone could not solve.

The notion that children use language to regulate peer behavior is documented by Dore (1978) and Ervin-Tripp (1972). Dore has described the speech acts preschoolers use to "get things done" with language, e.g., directives, regulatives, assertives. His and Ervin-Tripp's (1972) systems of speech acts were used in this study to examine the development of preschoolers' ability to regulate peer behavior with language. Second, the development of preschoolers' ability to use these speech acts to initiate and sustain oral discourse to direct peer behavior will be examined. These data should provide insight into the feasibility of using peer teaching strategies with preschoolers, and, more generally, into the egocentric/sociocentric nature of preschoolers' language.

Thirty-six preschoolers (22 girls and 14 boys) ranging in age from 38 months to 69 months were randomly chosen from a university preschool. From this sample children were grouped according to age: 3 year olds (38-47 months, $\bar{x}$ = 42.1), 4 year olds (48-59 months, $\bar{x}$ = 53.64), 5 year olds (60-69 months, $\bar{x}$ = 63.46).

Same-age dyads were taken to an experimental play room and seated at the same table. They were given two age-appropriate jig-saw puzzles each and told to do both puzzles. The experimenter sat at an adjacent

table transcribing children's utterances. Each session, which lasted 15 minutes, was videotaped.

All children's oral language was transcribed from the videotapes. Experimenter's transcripts supplemented the tapes when the latter source was incomprehensible. Transcripts were coded according to a speech act model developed by Dore (1978) and Ervin-Tripp (1972).

The major categories and subcategories follow. Agreement on the coding between two observers ranged from 58% to 92% ($\bar{x}$ = 78%) for major categories.

Requests	:	for choices, products, processes, actions, permission, suggestives.
Responses	:	yes/no, products, processes, compliances.
Assertives	:	identification, descriptions, internal reports, evaluations, attributions, rules.
Regulatives	:	attention getters, speaker selecting, rhetorical questions, clarification questions, boundary markers, politeness markers.
Expressives	:	exclamations, accompainments, repetition.
Directives	:	desires, imperatives, embedded imperatives, permission directives, directive questions, hints at directives.

An age (3: 3, 4, 5 year olds) x sex (2) x puzzle (2: puzzles) unbalanced ANOVA, using the general linear model, was calculated for each major speech act category. Newman-Keuls analyses, preset at .05, were used for post hoc analyses. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated between specific request/response pairs at each age level. No significant main effects or interactions were observed for assertives, regulatives or expressives. Significant main effects for age were observed on: directives, F (2,133) = 6.76, $p < .01$; 5 year olds generated more than both 3 and 4 year olds; rules and explanations, a subcategory of assertives, F (2,133) = 4.79, $p < .009$; 5's used more rules and explanations than 3's; responses, F (2,133) = 6.56, $p < .002$, 5's responded to more requests than both 3's and 4's. There was a significant main effect for sex on requests, F (1,133) = 7.85, $p < .005$, boys posed more than girls.

Correlations between choice, product, and process requests and response for each age level were calculated. Only for 5 year olds were the correlations statistically significant: choice, $r(62) = .40$,

$p < .001$; product, $r(62) = .495$, $p < .001$; process, $r(62) = .479$, $p < .0001$.

Analyses indicate that preschoolers, despite age, are capable of initiating discourse; their use of conversational regulatives and expressives did not vary with age. However, only the oldest group was able to use the more complex speech acts, i.e., rules and explanations, responding appropriately to requests, and directives to regulate peer behavior. The data on sustaining discourse are corroborated by the request/response correlations; the only group that consistently responded to requests appropriately was the 5 year olds. These data indicate that preschoolers, despite age, are capable of using social language to initiate discourse using requests, expressives, regulatives. However, only the oldest group possessed the pragmatic skills necessary to sustain discourse and use language to direct peer behavior, using rules, directives, and responding to questions. These data indicate that young preschoolers may not possess the pragmatic skills to engage in dyadic learning situations. They may not recognize the rules of discourse stating that speakers are obligated to respond to requests appropriately and that stating rules and directives guides peers' behavior. This study suggests that preschoolers' are sociocentric to the extent that they are willing and somewhat able to initiate and sustain discourse. They do, however, continue to refine their discourse skills through out the preschool period.

A description of Dore's system follows (6).

Speech Acts

Requestives solicit information or actions.

1. Choice Questions seek either - or judgments relative to propositions: "Is this an apple?"; "Is it red or green?"; "Right?".

2. Product Questions seek information relative to most "WH" interrogative pronouns: "Where's John?"; "What Happened?" "Who?"; "When?"

3. Process Questions seek extended descriptions or explanations: "Why did he go?"; "How did it happen?"; "What about him?"

4. Action Requests seek the performance of an action by hearer: "Give me it"; "Put the toy down!"

5. Permission Requests seek permission to perform an action: "May I go?"

6. Suggestions recommend the performance of an action by hearer or speaker both: "Let's do it!"; "Why don't you do it?"; "You should do it".

Assertives report facts, state rules, convey attitudes, etc.

1. Identifications label objects events, people, etc.: "That's a car."; "I'm Robin."; "We have a boat."

2. Descriptions predicate events, properties, locations, etc. of objects of people: "The car is red."; "It fell on the floor."; "We did it."

3. Internal Reports express emotions, sensations intents and other mental events; "I like it!" "It hurts."; "I'll do it."; "I know."

4. Evaluations express personal judgments or attitudes: "That's good."

5. Attributions report beliefs about another's internal state: "He does not know the answer."; "He wants to." "He can't do it."

6. Rules state procedures, definitions, "Social rules," etc.: "It goes in here."; "We don't fight in school."; "That happens later."

7. Explanations state reasons, causes, justifications, and predictions: "I did it because it's fun."; "It won't stay up there."

Responsives supply solicited information or acknowledge remarks.

1. Choice Answers provide solicited judgments of propositions: "Yes."

2. Product Answers provide Wh-information: "John's here."; "It fell."

3. Process answers provide solicited explanations, etc.: "I wanted to."

4. Compliances express acceptance, denial, or acknowledgment of requests: "Okay."; "Yes".; "I'll do it."

Regulatives control personal contact and conversational flow.

1. Attention-Getters solicit attention: "Hey!" "John!"; "Look."

2. Speaker selections label speaker of next turn: "John"; "You".

3. Rhetorical Questions seek acknowledgment to continue: "know what?"

4. Clarification Questions seek clarification of prior remark: "What?"

5. Boundary Markers indicate openings, closings and shifts in the conversation: "Hi!" "Bye!"; "Okay"; "Alright"; "By the way."

6. Politeness Markers indicate ostensible politeness: "Please"; "Thank you".

Expressives non-propositionally convey attitudes or repeat others.

1. Exclamations express surprise, delight or other attitudes: "Oh!"; "Wow".

2. Accompaniments maintain contact by supplying information redundant with respect to some contextual feature: "Here you are"; "There you go".

3. Repetitions repeat prior utterances.

Ervin-Tripp's (7) directive categories include:

Directives

1. Personal desires e.g., <u>I need that</u>.

2. Imperatives, e.g., <u>Get that</u>.

3. Embedded imperatives, e.g., <u>Would you get that</u>?

Table I

Means for speech acts and directives by age.

Speech category	Age I $\bar{x}$	Age II $\bar{x}$	Age III $\bar{x}$	Total $\bar{x}$
Requests	2.222	3.789	2.774	2.911
Assertives	5.083	7.131	8.758	7.330
Responses	1.444	1.973	3.741	2.639
Regulatives	.527	.710	.806	.705
Expressives	4.027	3.184	2.306	3.007
Directives	.472	1.131	2.661	1.654

Abramovitch, R., Carter, C., & Pepler, D. Observations of mixed-sex sibling dyads. Child Development, 1980, 51, 1268-1271.

Austin, J. How to do things with words. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Brown, A., & DeLoach, J. Skills, plans and self-regulation. In R. Siegler (Ed.), Children's thinking: What develops? Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1978.

Cooper, C.R., Ayers-Lopez, S., & Marquis, A. Children's discourse during peer learning in experimental and natural situations. Discourse Process, 1981, in press.

Dore, J. Variation in preschool children's conversational performances. In K. Nelson (Ed.), Children's language, Vol. I. New York: Wiley, 1978, pp. 397-444.

Ervin-Tripp, S. Wait for me, roller skate. In S. Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), Child discourse, New York: Academic Press, 1977, pp. 165-188.

Flavell, J. Role-taking and communication skills in children. In W. Hartup & N. Smothergill (Eds.), The young child. Washington, D.C.: NAEYC.

Garvey, C., & Berndt, R. The organization of pretend play. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, Chicago, 1975.

Garvey, C., & Hogan, R. Social speech and social interaction: egocentricism revisited. Child Development. 1973, 44, 562-568.

Luria, A. The role of speech in the regulation of normal and abnormal behavior. New York: Liverright, 1961.

Murray, F. Acquisition of conversation through social interaction. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 1-6.

Pellegrini, A. The development of preschoolers' private speech. Journal of Pragmatics, 1981, in press.

Piaget, J. The language and thought of the child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1926.

Searle, J. Speech acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Vygotsky, L. Thought and language. Cambridge: MIT, 1962.

Vygotsky, L. Mind in society. Cambridge: Harvard, 1978.

Wertsch, J. The regulation of human action and the given-new organization of private speech. In G. Zivin (Ed.), The development of self-regulation through private speech. New York: Wiley, 1979, pp. 79-98.

Winer, Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Anne Ruggles Gere

Abstract

Writing to Learn in the Humanities

Purpose: This study investigates how writing functions as a mode of learning for high school students. Questions addressed include these:

1) What is the relationship between using writing as a learning tool and learning writing as a skill in its own right?

2) What kinds of writing tasks are most effective in enabling students to learn in content areas?

3) Do effective tasks vary across ability groupings of students?

Theory: This study, part of a large project funded by NEH, builds upon the growing body of theory which posits a relationship between writing and learning. Odell (1973), Martin et al. (1976), Emig (1977), Britton (1977), Graves (1978), Freisinger (1980) and Wotring (1980) are representative of the theorists and researchers who have affirmed that writing aids learning. The conclusion of Wotring's (1980) study is particularly important to this work because Wotring found that only four of 26 students were able to write to learn about chemistry. Wotring suggests that the majority of students in her study did not conceptualize writing as a way of thinking; they saw writing as a final offering of ideas to a reader rather than a means of figuring out for themselves. Building upon Wotring's work, this study tests three hypotheses: that students need direct instruction in writing-to-learn because cultural

views of writing prohibit them from using writing for their own purposes; that some forms of writing-to-learn will be more effective than others; and that students' ability levels contribute to the relationship between writing and learning.

Procedure: Twenty two teachers of high school literature and social studies participated in the five-week 1981 summer program in which they investigated various procedures for writing to learn. These procedures include: course journals, reading logs, loop writing, metaphoric writing, direct writing, precis writing, nutshelling ideas, treeing ideas, focused free writing, staging scenarios, playing out analogies, and dialogue writing.

The twenty two teachers developed units of study which incorporated these writing procedures into existing courses in literature and social studies. The goal in every course is to use writing as a way of learning the content more effectively. Courses include American literature, humanities, introduction to literature, world civilization, frontier America, U.S. history, Washington state history, and Pacific rim cultures. These units are being piloted during the fall term. Monitoring of student performance in these units includes: measures of student attitudes toward writing, cross-class comparisons of content learned, task analysis of writing procedures used and results achieved, and comparison of the writing and learning of students in regular classes with that of students in special education classes. Findings available in November will provide preliminary answers to the three questions posed by this study.

Implications: This project is based entirely in the classroom. Teachers employ writing procedures they have adapted to their own purposes and

they monitor much of the learning which results from these procedures. The most important aspect of this work is that it suggests ways of incorporating writing-to-learn into existing classes, points to strategies which will be most effective in helping students write to learn and explores how less able students can write to learn.

Handouts

Sample units developed to facilitate learning through writing

Wednesday, September 16

Writing groups will meet for entire period.

Activity:

Share letters based on response to Jonathan Edwards.

Students should remember to stick to assignment and not be critical of another student's point of view concerning Edwards as reflected in the student's letter.

Make comments and suggestions for revision.

Final draft will be due Friday, September 18 at beginning of period (BOP).

Assignment: Read William Bird, pp. 443-446; William Bradford, pp. 428-430.

Thursday, September 17

Focused free write: Bird and Bradford chose a journal format as the vehicle by which they would record their responses to early colonial life. Choose either Bird or Bradford. What aspects of colonial life and/or thinking emerge in the work of this writer that do not show in what we have read of Jonathan Edwards?

After 10-15 minutes, students will summarize entries with a word, phrase, or sentence.

Share these "capsules," differentiating between Bird and Bradford.

Discuss notion of love-death as it is evinced by Bradford's journal.

Discuss differences between Bradford's responses and what we find in Bird.

How might we account for differences?
Were these men not concerned with orthodox religion?

From our reading of the journals of Bird and Bradford, what may we conclude about how a journal is written?

Present journal writing.

Unit 2: The Native American Frontier

Time: 12-15 days

Objectives:

The student should:

1. Understand how Native American Cultures responded differently to specific environmental conditions.
2. Be aware of Native American contributions to the development of America.
3. Understand how changing conditions in the East motivated non-Indians to explore and claim land in the West.
4. Familiarize themselves with the general heritage of the American Indian.
5. Be able to recognize, define and explain the following related concepts: (a) Aggression, (b) Reservation, (c) Multi-Culture, (d) Acculturation, (e) Assimilation, (f) Genocide, (g) Artifacts, (h) Tangible and Intangible Objects, (i) Stereotype, (j) Pantheism.
6. Be aware that many Americans have not shared in our recent prosperity.

Learning Resources	Learning Activities
Text: American Frontier: Chapter 2 and pp. 234-240.	Lecture-discussion concerning background factual material presented in the text. Objective test over this assignment at about day 10.
Monahan, et.al., American Literature-The West, pp. 50-51.	Using a Navajo prayer as a generating frame, students will translate this prayer to present day language, utilizing modeling techniques.
Reflexive Writing Exercise: Text, pp. 234-240 and the Film, Indians, OSU #9480.	Topic: Chivington Massacre, students read selection in the text and view the film. Then each student will be asked to write a dialogue, taking both sides, from the point of view of the Indian and also that of the Army.
	Letter writing assignment: The student assumes the role of an Indian protesting the breaking of several treaties and writes to the government about this.
Film: End of the Trail, EF #2175	Study group critique of this two-part film. Recorders tell rest of the class of their group's consensus.
American Heritage Historical Atlas, Cole, Atlas of American History, Denoyer-Geppert outline map of the United States 48 states.	Map assign: Students locate the tribal areas of the major tribes in the Trans-Mississippi West. A test on this assignment will be given toward the end of the unit.

Student Learning Objectives	Goals/ Objectives	Purpose of Activity	Literature (reading)	Writing	Group Activity	Teacher Activit
The student: values a writer's ability to persuade. is able to recognize and respond to different values presented in literature. is able to demonstrate comprehension of/application of the concept of code by writing a personal code of behavior. is able to work in small groups, answering comprehension questions about the literature.	.Understand concept of values as applicable to the individual .Analyze literature to determine individual values being expressed. .Clarify response to values. .Clarify/ examine own values. .Based upon given point of view, write expression presenting that point of view, responding with disagreement to another piece of literature.	.Articulate own values. Examine own values. .Understand way of turning into self/clarify own obstacles.	Monday: "Karma Repair Kit: Items 1-4" (481)	Autobiopoem Journal - focused freewrite. Journal-focused freewrite.	Discussion of poem.	Distribute auto poem format. Oral Reading.
		.Understand individual clarification of personal code. .Compare with own. .Compare responses w/ others. .Articulate own code.	Tuesday: "Young Puritan's Code" (432)	Reading log - points of individual agreement. Journal - develop code (limit to 10).	Discussion.	Oral Reading. Assign Patrick H Speech to Debate Speech Student.
		.Understand persuasive language. .Compare responses. .Identify points learned in comparison.	Wednesday: "Patrick Henry, Speech to the Virginia Convention" (120)	Reading log - reflexive.	Large class discussion questions.	(Speech student
		Demonstrate valuing Henry's ability to persuade & develop own response representing contrary	Thursday:	Direct write/ Fast write (Individually)		Introduce Direct Writing Topic.

Detailed Plan for Week 1, Continued

Day 3

Patrick Henry, Speech to the Virginia Convention

(25 mins.) Introduce student orally presenting speech. Student introduces and reads.

Class Discussion Questions:

(15 mins.)

1. Some members of the Virginia Convention were in favor of arming themselves against England; others were not. What does Patrick Henry say that should change the minds of those not in favor? Pick out those statements of his that you feel are most effective.
2. Do you think Henry is appealing to the hearts or to the minds of his listeners? Cite specific lines or examples of his appealing.
3. What are the cliches/phrases of the time that Henry uses?

Reading Log:

Reflexive entry:

List new learnings or things you learned from the reading and discussing of the speech.
Or list points/areas you had trouble with.
In either case, explore what you think Henry's thoughts might have to do with today. (If Henry were alive today, what might he be doing - what causes might he be supporting?)

Day 4

Direct Writing extended writing assignment:

(15 mins.) Introduce/hand out topic:

Not all members of the Virginia Convention were prepared to take arms against England. (As a matter of fact, the revolution was supported by less than a third of the Colonists). Patrick Henry's speech was intended to change their minds. Presumably it did. But suppose you had been there. And suppose that after listening to Patrick Henry's rousing speech, you did not change your mind. How would you have answered Patrick Henry? Write a speech in which you present your side. Try to finish your speech with a memorable last line.

Introduce Schedule:

Day 4: Fast write (45 minutes)
Day 5: Revised write
Day 6: Writing groups
Day 7: Turn in formal drafts and all previous work.

Evaluating Criteria:

Speech tone vs. essay tone
In the tone of Henry's contemporary language.
Catches audience (Henry and Virginia Convention members) and keeps contact with audience.
Side is presented, with answer to Patrick Henry.

Bibliography

Arlin, Patricia. "Cognitive Development in Adulthood: A Fifth Stage?" Developmental Psychology, 11 (1975), 602-606.

Berzonsky, Michael D. "Formal Reasoning in Adolescence: An Alternate View," Adolescence, XIII (Summer 1978), 279-289.

Beyer, Barry K. "Using Writing to Learn in History," The History Teacher, p. 167-178.

Britton, James. Language and Learning. Maryland: Penguin Books Inc., 1970.

Bruner, Jerome. Toward a Theory of Instruction. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1978.

Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell. Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging. Illinois: NCTE, 1977.

Davis, Kenneth and John Hollowell, ed. Inventing and Playing Games in the English Classroom. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

Draper, Virginia. Formative Writing; Writing to Assist Learning in all Subject Areas. California: University of California, Berkeley. 1979.

Elbow, Peter. Writing with Power. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1981.

Emig, Janet. The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English. 1971.

-------. "Writing as a Mode of Learning," College Composition and Communication, p. 122-128.

Fitzgerald, Frances. America Revised. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Flower, Linda. Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1981.

Flower, Linda S. and John R. Hayes. "Problem-Solving Strategies and the Writing Process," College English, 39 (December 1977), 449-461.

Freisinger, Randall. "Cross-disciplinary Writing Workshops: Theory and Practice," College English, 42 (October 1980), 154-166.

Graves, Donald H. "Balance the Basics: Let Them Write," Learning, (April 1978), 30-33.

Gregg, Lee W. and Erwin R. Steinberg, ed. Cognitive Processes in Writing. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

Hamilton, David. "Interdisciplinary Writing," College English, 41 (March 1980), 780-795.

Hawkins, Thom. Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English. 1976.

Herrington, Anne J. "Writing to Learn: Writing Across the Disciplines," College English, 43 (April 1981), 379-387.

Irmscher, William F. Teaching Expository Writing. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

-------. "The Teaching of Writing in Terms of Growth," English Journal, 66 (December 1977), 33-36.

Kantor, Ken and Jack Perron. "Thinking and Writing: Creativity in the Modes of Discourse," Language Arts, 54 (October 1977), 742-749.

Katz, Marilyn. "From Self-Analysis to Academic Analysis: An Approach to Expository Writing," 40 (November 1978), p. 288-292.

McCrimmon, James M. "Writing as a Way of Knowing," Rhetoric and Composition, pp. 3-12.

Macrorie, Ken. Searching Writing. New Jersey: Hayden Book Company, Inc. 1980.

Maimon, Elaine P., et al. Writing in the Arts and Sciences. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc. 1981.

Mandelbaum, David G., ed. Edward Sapir: Culture, Language and Personality. California: University of California Press, 1949.

Markora, A. K. The Teaching and Mastery of Language. New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc. 1979.

Martin, Nancy, et al. Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1976.

Moffett, James. Student-centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.

-------. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Odell, Lee. "Responding to Student Writing," College Composition and Communication, 24 (December 1973), 394-400.

-------. "Piaget, Problem-Solving, and Freshman Composition," College Composition and Communication, 24 (February 1973), 36-42.

Paul, Michael. "Invention: Understanding the Relationship Between Sensation, Perception, and Concept Formation," College Composition and Communication, 25 (May 1974), 205-209.

Piaget, Jean. The Language and Thought of the Child. New York: New American Library, 1974.

Pillion, Bryant. "Language Across the Curriculum: Examining the Place of Language in Our Schools."

Raimes, Ann. "Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum: The Experience of a Faculty Seminar," College English, 41 (March 1980), 797-801.

Rohman, D. Gordon. "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process," College Composition and Communication, pp. 106-112.

Shaughnessy, Mina P. Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Smith, Frank. "The Language Arts and the Learner's Mind," Language Arts, 56 (February 1979), 118-125, 145.

Smith, Myrna J. "Bruner on Writing," College Composition and Communication, 27 (May 1977), 129-133.

Stanford, Gene, Chair, and the Committee on Classroom Practices. How to Handle the Paper Load. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1979.

Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and Language. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1962.

White, Hayden. "Interpretation in History," New Literary History, pp. 281-314.

Wotring, Anne Miller. "Writing To Think About High School Chemistry." Master thesis, George Mason University, 1980.

Diane E. DeFord

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECT ON READING DEVELOPMENT

Effective instruction has been the concern of reading educators for decades. The purpose of the first grade studies (Bond & Dykstra, 1967) was to find the most effective approach to teach reading. While this purpose was not met, and has not been met in subsequent studies, reading researchers are still fascinated with the topic. Because of inconclusive evidence in studies seeking to prove the overall effectiveness of one approach over another, many have been lead to suggest that the teacher is the important variable, not the methods used (Carroll and Chall, 1975; Bond and Dykstra, 1967; Ramsey, 1962; Brophy and Good, 1974). Consequently, recent research has attempted to explore factors related to the teacher's belief system and the environment developed for the teaching of reading (Steinruck, 1975; Harste and Burke, 1976; Belli, Blom & Reiser, 1977; Bawden, Buike and Duffy, 1979; Mitchell, 1978, 1980; DeFord, 1978; and Hoffman & Baker, 1980).

The paper to be presented has at its basis the assumption that effectiveness in reading must be defined through the strategies readers use, not just pre and post test gains, and that these strategies are instructionally influenced as well as qualitatively different. Three first grade classrooms were studied for a period of seven months. The teachers were selected on the basis of excellence in teaching (recommended by administrators familiar with their teaching) and represented a phonics, skills and whole language orientation to the teaching of reading. These orientations were confirmed through use of the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP, DeFord 1978) and through interviews and obser-

vations. The teachers rank-ordered their classes as to reading ability. From this list, nine students (three high, three middle and three low) were chosen for further study (N=27). The children read four times during the year (September, November, February and March) on instructional and predictable materials. The readings were taped and subjected to analysis utilizing the Reading Miscue Inventory (Goodman and Burke, 1972).

Each classroom exhibited clearcut patterns of strategy usage indicated through miscue analysis. The phonics room depended mainly on decoding strategies. This dependence could be seen in several ways:

1) A low percentage of omissions
2) High graphic and sound similarity in substitutions
3) Regressions, or repetitions, on the word level, with multiple attempts at sounding out single words
4) A high percentage of the substitutions were non-words

Readers instructed by a skills approach exhibited a high percentage of omissions. Their substitutions were real words that also exhibited high graphic similarity to the text. Further analysis of these substitutions indicated that a high percentage of them came from the word lists the teacher had introduced in previous lessions, highlighting the dependence on word recognition strategies.

The readers within the whole language class tended to manipulate the text as if they were editing the message; meaning was highly similar and acceptable, but miscues were lower in graphic similarity when compared to the authors' texts. They used a greater variety of strategies, and insisted that what they read should make sense and should sound like the language they heard daily.

An analysis of student comprehension suggested that all children had better comprehension on predictable stories. It would appear that controlled vocabulary texts offer little for students to comprehend. The whole language program generated better retelling scores and the children used more story conventions in their retellings. The consistent presentation of well formed stories acted as an aid to comprehension and a model for future language experiences.

These data would indicate that children's strategy usage is instructionally influenced, with certain patterns arising from the strategies the teacher supported. It was also suggested that the quality of the language interaction and the variety of written materials was important to expanded competence. The contrived models for reading that were provided did not offer the children the complexity of information they needed to understand what they read. Part of effective teaching, then, is to allow children to use the wealth of information they have available to them, and not utilize instructional techniques and materials that will interfere with their use of the process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bawden, R., Buike, S. and Duffy, G. Teacher Conceptions of Reading and Their Influence on Instruction. Research Series No. 47, The Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, May, 1979.

Belli, G., Blom, G., & Reiser, A. Teachers' Concerns and Conceptions of Reading and The Teaching of Reading: A Literature Review. Occational Paper No. 1, The Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1977.

Bond, Guy L., and Dykstra, Robert. "The Cooperative Reading Program in First Grade Reading." Reading Research Quarterly, 1967, 2, pp. 5-142.

Brophy, J. and Good, T. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Carroll, John B. and Chall, J.S. Toward a Literate Society: The Report of the Committee on Reading of the National Academy of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

DeFord, D.E. A Validation Study of an Instrument to Determine a Teacher's Theoretical Orientation to Reading Instruction. Unpublished Dissertation, Indiana University, 1978.

Goodman, Y., and Burke, C. The Reading Miscue Inventory. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1972.

Harste, J.C. and Burke, C. "A New Hypothesis for Reading Teacher Research: Both the Teaching and Learning of Reading is Theoretically Based." 26th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. P. David Pearson, ed., 1976.

Hoffman, J., & Baker, C. Observing Communication During Oral Reading Instruction: A Critique of Past Research and a Report on the Development of a Taxonomy of Behaviors Useful in Field Based Research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, May 1980.

Mitchell, K. Patterns of Teacher-Student Responses to Oral Reading Errors as Related to Teachers' Previous Training in Different Theoretical Frameworks. Unpublished dissertation, New York University, 1978.

Mitchell, K. "Patterns of Teacher-Student Responses to Oral Reading Errors as Related to Teachers' Theoretical Frameworks." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 14, 10. 3, Oct. 1980, pp. 243-263.

Ramsey, W.Z. "An Evaluation of Three Methods of Teaching Reading." Challenge and Experiment in Reading. A. Figurel, ed., International Reading Conference Proceedings, 7, 1962, p. 153.

Steinruck, Yvonne Siu. The Effects of Instruction in Miscue Analysis on Teachers' Perceptions of the Reading Process and on Their Instruction in Reading. Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1975.

Abstract
The Development of the
Comprehension of Metaphor

The purpose of this study was: to determine the extent to which children can comprehend a verbal metaphor embedded in a story; the extent to which they can explain a verbal metaphor embedded within a story; and how comprehension of and the ability to explain metaphor vary with age.

A sample of 36 (18 males and 18 females) was drawn from private and public schools in New York and New Jersey. Children were grouped according to age: nine ranged from ages 52-63 months ($\bar{X}$=55); ten from 85-103 months ($\bar{X}$=93); eight from 128-160 months ($\bar{X}$=147); and nine from 179-196 months ($\bar{X}$=186).

Three stories were constructed in which the last, or target, sentence was contextually, rather than sententially, anomalous; that is, the sentence was literally comprehensible when standing alone but metaphoric within the context of the story. Five pictures were drawn to accompany each story, two relating to the literal meaning of the target sentence, two to the metaphoric meaning of the target sentence, and one with no apparent connection to the story at all. The language of the stories was controlled for syntactic and lexical difficulty. All situations presented in the stories were judged by the researchers to be within the realm of the participants' experience. Questions were constructed which asked about the meaning of the story. Each question could be answered through picture manipulation and all participants were

also asked to explain their answers.

The data collection sessions were audio-taped and were transcribed by the researchers at the completion of that process. Notes were also taken during the data collection by the researchers.

The protocols were examined for: evidence of literal comprehension through picture manipulation; evidence of metaphoric comprehension through picture manipulation; evidence of metaphoric comprehension through verbal explanation. These results were then examined with reference to the stated objectives.

Six general modes of comprehension, similar to those observed by Piaget (1977), were observed in this study. The modes ranged from difficulty with literal comprehension to an immediate understanding and verbal explanation of the metaphoric relation presented in each story. The modes of comprehension were developmentally linked in that depth of understanding increased with age. Ability to explain metaphoric structures also increased with age.

The examination of the protocols indicated that the comprehension of metaphor seems to be a developmental phenomenon. Comprehension increased with age, beginning with little or no comprehension in the $\bar{X}$=55 age group and developing progressively until immediate and full comprehension appeared in the $\bar{X}$=186 age group. It was clear that metaphor is understood before it can be explained. Children were able to construct the metaphoric pairs and even label the metaphoric relations before they were able to verbalize the metaphoric implications of the target sentence. A full discussion of metaphoric relations appeared only with the acquisition of the language appropriate to this kind of discussion.

Story I

The sun went down. Stars began to shine. The sky darkened and the stars became brighter. Soon it was night. The diamonds shone on the black velvet.

Pictures: stars, diamonds, sky, velvet, cat.

Story II

Joe built a snow fort in the backyard. Nancy built a fort in the backyard also. Both of them made a big pile of snowballs. Finally they were ready to begin. The bullets flew in both directions.

Pictures: snowballs, bullets, snowfight, battle, horse.

Story III

Vacation was fun. Every day Lynn went to the beach. She and her family made sand castles. Soon it was time to drive back to the city. The curtain came down on the play.

Pictures: car returning to city, curtain down, beach, play, flower.

Frequency of Responses by Age by Stage

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6	Total
Age I ($\bar{X}$=55)	9	13	4	0	0	0	26
Age II ($\bar{X}$=93)	0	22	4	3	1	0	30
Age III ($\bar{X}$=147)	0	1	0	0	16	5	22
Age IV ($\bar{X}$=186)	0	1	0	2	14	9	26

Means and Standard Deviations
of Stages by Story and Age

	Story 1		Story 2		Story 3	
Age	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
$\bar{X}$=55	1.625	.744	2.125	.640	1.875	.640
$\bar{X}$=93	2.400	.699	2.700	1.059	2.200	.632
$\bar{X}$=147	5.33	.516	5.166	.408	4.666	1.366
$\bar{X}$=186	4.75	1.28	5.375	.517	5.375	.517

One-Way ANOVA Summaries for Age

Story	df	SS	MS	F	p
1	3.4	72.110	24.037	31.885	.001
2	3.4	65.192	21.731	38.796	.001
3	3.4	73.817	24.606	38.961	.001

Multiple Comparisons (SNK)
Grouped at .05 Level

Story 1 $\bar{X}_1 = 1.556$

$\bar{X}_2 = 2.400$

$\bar{X}_3 = 5.375$ $\bar{X}_4 = 4.889$

Story 2 $\bar{X}_1 = 2.111$ $\bar{X}_2 = 2.700$

$\bar{X}_3 = 5.125$ $\bar{X}_4 = 5.375$

Story 3 $\bar{X}_1 = 1.875$ $\bar{X}_2 = 2.200$

$\bar{X}_3 = 4.667$ $\bar{X}_4 = 5.222$

Bibliography
The Development of the Comprehension of Metaphor

Anderson, R. C., & Ortony, A. On putting apples into bottles: A problem of polysemy. Cognitive Psychology, 1975, 7, 167-180.

Billow, R. M. A cognitive developmental study of metaphor comprehension. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 415-423.

Billow, R. M. Metaphor: A review of the psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 81-92.

Chukovsky, K. From two to five. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Cometa, M. S., & Eson, M. E. Logical operations and metaphor interpretation: A Piagetian model. Child Development, 1978, 49, 649-659.

Emig, J. Children and metaphor. Research in the Teaching of English, 1972, 6, 163-175.

Gallagher, J. McC. The future of formal thought research: The study of analogy and metaphor. In B. Z. Pressein, D. Goldstein, and M. H. Appel (Eds.), Topics in cognitive development (vol. 2): Language and operational thought. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.

Gardner, H., Winner, E., Bechhofer, R., & Wolf, D. The development of figurative language. In K. Nelson (Ed.), Children's language (vol. 1). New York: Gardner Press, 1978.

Grindstaff, F. L. & Muller, A. L. The national assessment of literature: Two reviews. Research in the Teaching of English, 1975, 9, 80-106.

Ortony, A. Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice. Educational Theory, 1975, 25, 45-53.

Ortony, A. Metaphor and literature: Theory and methodology. Paper presented at the Buffalo Conference on Researching Responses to Literature and the Teaching of Literature, State University of New York at Buffalo, October, 1977.

Ortony, A. Beyond literal similarity (Tech. Rep. 105). Urbana-Champaign, Ill.: Center for the Study of Reading, October, 1978.

Ortony, A. Some psycholinguistic aspects of metaphor (Tech. Re. 112). Champaign-Urbana, Ill.: Center for the Study of Reading, January, 1979.

Ortony, A. Metaphor and thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Ortony, A., Reynolds, R. E., & Arter, J. A. Metaphor: Theoretical and empirical research. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 919-943.

Ortony, A., Shallert, D. L., Reynolds, R. E., & Antos, S. J. Interpreting metaphors and idioms: Some effects of context on comprehension. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1978, 17, 465-477.

Pollio, M. R. & Pollio, H. R. The development of figurative language in children. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 1974, 3, 185-201.

Pollio, M. R. & Pollio, H. R. A test of metaphoric comprehension and some preliminary developmental data. Journal of Child Language, 1979, 6, 111-128.

Reynolds, R. E. & Ortony, A. Some issues in the measurement of children's comprehension of metaphorical language. Child Development, 1980, 51, 1110-1119.

Turner, T. Piaget's structuralism. American Anthropologist, 1973 75, 351-373.

Verbrugge, R. R. & McCarrell, N. S. Metaphoric comprehension: Studies in reminding and resembling. Cognitive Psychology, 1977, 9, 494-533.

Winner, E., Rosensteil, A., & Gardner, H. The development of metaphoric understanding. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 289-297.

Sandra Stotsky

A REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN READING AND WRITING: DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

ABSTRACT

Inasmuch as reading, writing, listening, and speaking are all language processes, one can assume an interrelationship among them. However, the exact nature of these relationships is unclear, as well as the role of developmental and pedagogical factors in these interrelationships. A large body of research has been devoted to conceptualizing the reading process and to exploring the development of reading skills, much of it from the perspective of the relationship of beginning reading to oral language development. Unfortunately, most reading research has been conducted with little inquiry into the role of writing activity as a dependent or independent variable. In parallel fashion, much research in composition teaching has tended to focus upon methodological and motivational issues from the perspective of the relationship of writing to oral language. Again, most writing research has been conducted without regard for reading ability as a dependent or independent variable. As a result, we know little about the relationship between reading and writing or whether each may enhance the other's development, possibly in different ways at different developmental stages.

This paper offers an empirically derived framework for categorizing existing research on reading/writing relationships, together with a review and synthesis of the findings from the few correlational and experimental studies in this area. The paper concludes with a summary of what we know about the relationship between reading and writing and with suggestions for future theoretical and instructional research in this area.

A review of studies on the relationships between reading and writing suggests that the research may be categorized in the following manner.

1. Studies correlating measures of reading with measures of writing.
2. Studies examining the influence of writing on reading. In this category, two types of studies can be found: those attempting to improve writing, with effects on reading; those attempting to improve reading through the use of writing.
3. Studies examining the influence of reading on writing. This category can also be subdivided into two types: those attempting to improve reading, with effects on writing; those attempting to improve writing through the use of reading.

Conclusions

Several issues emerge from this review of the literature. First, one is struck by the relative paucity of studies in this area, compared to the vast number of studies in either reading or writing research. Reasons for the lack of research on the interrelation of the two major components of literacy must remain speculative; possibly they relate to differences among researchers in their professional training and experience, in their curricular emphasis, or in theoretical approaches. Whatever the reasons, our knowledge base in this area is minimal; yet the few studies that have been done do tell use something and suggest directions for future research.

First, while the studies correlating measures of reading achievement with measures of writing achievement almost all show high correlations between good readers and good writers, none examined the traits of good readers/poor writers or poor readers/good writers. An analysis of these two groups of students in future experiments may shed more light on the relationship between reading and writing.

Second, the experimental studies are almost unanimous in finding effects of reading and writing upon each other; improvement in writing ability or writing practice can lead to improved reading comprehension; improvement in reading, increased reading experiences, reading instruction, or the study of literature can lead to improved writing skills. However, some studies did not measure gains in both reading and writing, and none showed how gains in one may be systematically linked to gains in the other.

Third, many studies examined only syntactic aspects of writing ability in relation to reading achievement. None of the studies developed or used specific measures of lexical maturity or complexity in children's writing in order to examine the relationship between writing vocabulary and reading achievement. Specific measures to define and assess lexical growth in writing are needed.

Fourth, all the studies reviewed in this paper examined relationships between reading and writing in native language speakers. There is apparently no research at the upper elementary and secondary level examining the writing of English-as-a-Second-Language students and the relationship between traits in their writing and their reading scores in English. Studies of the writing of ESL students of various language groups in relation to their level of proficiency in English in both speech and reading seems needed not only from the practical point of view of error analysis but from a theoretical perspective as well. Research in this area might provide significant data with which to assess the relative influence of reading and speech on writing.

Selected References

Bossone, R. & Quitman, L.A. A strategy for coping with high school and college remedial English problems. 1976. ERIC Document ED 130 268.

Collins, C. The effect of writing experiences in the expressive mode upon the reading, self-esteem, attitudes, and academic achievement of freshmen in a college reading course. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1979.

Combs, W. Examining the fit of practice in syntactic manipulation and scores of reading comprehension. In Sentence-Combining and the Teaching of Writing. D. Daiker, A. Kerek, & M. Morenberg (Eds.), Arkansas: University of Central Arkansas, 1979.

DeVries, T. Reading, writing frequency, and expository writing. Reading Improvement, Vol. 7, 1979, 14, 15, 19.

Evanechko, P., Ollila, L., & Armstrong, R. An investigation of the relationship between children's performance in written language and their reading ability. Research in the Teaching of English, 8 (3), Winter 1974, 315-326.

Glazer, J.I. The effect of literature study on the ability of fourth and sixth grade pupils to create written stories. Final Report. Providence: Rhode Island College, 1973. ED 095 538.

Grimmer, F. The effects of an experimental program in written composition on the writing of second-grade children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970. Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 31, No. 11, 5666 A.

Heil, H. The development of selected language variables in two modes of writing and their relationship to reading comprehension in the primary grades. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 38, No. 1, 137-A.

Jencke, G. A study of precis writing as a composition technique. Contributions to Education, No. 644. New York, N.Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

Laxdowski, W. Determining reading grade levels from analysis of written compositions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1976.

Loban, W. The language of elementary school children. Research Report No. 1, National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Mills, E. Children's literature and teaching written composition. Elementary English, October 1974, 971-973.

Newlun, C. Teaching children to summarize in fifth grade history. Contributions to Education, No. 404. N.Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930.

Shanahan, T. A canonical correlational analysis of learning to read and learning to write: an exploratory analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1980.

Smith, R., Jensen, K., & Dillingofski, M. The effects of integrating reading and writing on four variables. Research in the Teaching of English, 1971, 5 (2), 179-189.

Woodfin, M. Correlations among certain factors and the written expression of third grade children. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 1237-1242.

Zeman, S. Reading comprehension and writing of second and third graders. Reading Teacher, Vol.23, No. 2, November 1969, 144-150.

Stephen P. Witte

TOWARD A MODEL FOR WRITING COURSE EVALUATION

For many years, teachers of writing and composition specialists have sought to identify effective ways of teaching students to write. Indeed, Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer reported in 1963 that the vast majority of studies in written composition up until that time were pedagogical ones; and according to Cooper and Odell's "Introduction" to Research on Composing, the situation had not much changed in the intervening decade and a half. In addition, both Research in Written Composition and Research on Composing raise serious questions about the value of pedagogical research on writing instruction; and some researchers have even called for what amounts to a moratorium on pedagogical research until such time as some "basic" questions facing composition specialists have been answered, questions having to do with both the production of written texts and the nature of the texts themselves. However, the need to assess both what we teach in the composition classroom and how we go about teaching it persists.

At the present time, this need is more pronounced than ever. In response to the so-called "literacy crisis" and in response to recent research on written texts and text production, educators have developed new writing courses or modified existing ones. These courses embody new emphases on curricular components and often require new instructional methods. Among the curricular components now receiving greater emphasis are a host of process variables, including problem-solving strategies and heuristics, revision, and composing itself. Frequently, these curricular components are placed in the context of one or another taxonomy of discourse types, taxonomies which often themselves help shape the curricula of writing courses. New curricular emphases and new ways of viewing composition curricula often lead to the use of new instructional methods; and in recent years a substantial body of literature has resulted on such methods as peer tutoring, collaborative learning, workshopping, conferencing, and sentence combining. However, with the exception of the work of Richard Larson's CCCC Committee on Teaching and Its Evaluation in Composition, very little has been done to advance the art of evaluating college-level composition courses, either the curricula they teach or the instructional methods used to do so.

The type of research which leads to evaluations of writing courses differs fundamentally from the kind of research which is designed to investigate "basic" questions on discourse production and on written products. In attempting to answer

"basic" research questions, researchers have the advantage of controlling many of the variables which affect composing or written texts; and well-designed "basic" research typically controls the variables involved so that very specific research questions can be posed and answered. In contrast, evaluation research seldom has the luxury of so controlling the research situation. Rather, it takes the writing course in all its complexity and attempts to determine whether the course is good or bad, adequate or inadequate. The present paper argues that a number of crucial elements must be examined in order to arrive at an estimate, whether formative or summative, of the worth of a course. These elements are four in number: (1) the context in which the course is taught, (2) the content and focus of the course and their expression through goals and objectives, (3) the instruction, and (4) the performance of students as a result of having gone through the course. These elements, the paper argues, constantly interact with one another. Various aspects of these various elements are delineated and examined, but special attention is paid to the effect of context on the other three elements.

These elements and the interactions among them constitute a model for evaluating writing courses. The usefulness of this model is explored in terms of different approaches to evaluation, among them the "outcomes" approach, the "system analysis" approach, the "adversary" approach, the "case study" approach, and the "goal-free" approach. The paper shows that regardless of what approach one takes to evaluating writing courses, the four elements specified in the conceptual model must be accommodated.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Alkin, M. C. "Framing the Decision Context." AERA Cassette Series in Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1975.

Alkin, M. C. "Products for Improving Educational Evaluation." Evaluation Comment, 2, no. 3 (1970), 1-15.

Barnes, R. E., and A. L. Ginsburg. "Revelance of the RMC Models for Title 1 Concerns." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1 (March-April, 1979), 7-14.

Bloom, B. S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: McKay, 1956.

Bloom, B. S., J. T. Hastings, and G. Madaus. Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New Yrok: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Borg, W. R., and M. D. Gall. Educational Research: An Introduction. 3rd ed. New York and London: Langman, 1979.

Guba, E. G. Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1978.

Guttentag, M. "Subjectivity and Its Use in Evaluation Research." Evaluation, 1, no. 2 (1973), 60-65.

Guttentag, M., and K. Snapper. "Plans, Evaluations, and Decisions." Evaluation, 2. no. 1 (1974), 58-74.

House, E. R. Evaluating with Validity. Beverly Hills and London: Sage, 1980.

Kogan, M., and T. Packwood. Adversary Councils and Committees in Education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

Lewy, A. (ed.). Handbook of Curriculum Evaluation. Paris and New York: UNESCO and Longman, 1977.

Mager, R. F. Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction. San Francisco: Fearon, 1962.

MacDonald, B. Evaluation and the Control of Education. Norwich, England: Centre for Applied Research in Education, 1974.

McLaughlin, M. W. Evaluation and Reform. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1975.

Owens, T. R. "Educational Evaluation by Adversary Proceedings." In E. R. House (ed.), School Evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1973.

Partlett, M., and D. Hamilton. "Evaluation as Illumination: A New Approach to the Study of Innovatory Programmes." In D. Hamilton, et al. (eds.), Beyond the Numbers Game. London: Macmillan, 1977.

Patton, M. Q. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Patton, M. Q. Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills and London: Sage, 1978.

Popham, W. J. Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Popham, W. J., and D. Carlson. "Deep Dark Deficits of the Adversary Evaluation Model." Educational Researcher, 6 (1977), 3-6.

Rivlin, A. M. Systematic Thinking for Social Action. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1971.

Rossi, P. H., H. E. Freeman, and S. R. Wright. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Beverly Hills and London: Sage, 1979.

Rutman, L. Evaluation Research Methods: A Basic Guide. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1977.

Scriven, M. "Evaluation Bias and Its Control." In G. V. Glass (ed.), Evaluation Studies Review Annual, vol. 1. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1976.

Scriven, M. "Goal Free Evaluation." In E. R. House (ed.), School Evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1973.

Scriven, M. "The Methodology of Evaluation." In R. W. Tyler (ed.), Perspectives in Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Stake, R. E. "The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry." Educational Researcher, 7 (February, 1978), 5-8.

Stake, R. E. Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill, 1975.

Stake, R. E. Evaluating Educational Programmes: The Need and the Response. Washington, D.C.: OECD Publications Center, 1976.

Stake, R. E. "Language, Rationality and Assessment." In W. H. Beatty (ed.) Improving Educational Assessment. Washing-

ton, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

Stenzel, N. Committee Hearings as an Evaluation Format. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1979.

Stufflebeam, D. L. "An Introduction to the PDK Book." In B. Worthen and J. R. Sanders (eds.), Educational Evaluation. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones, 1973.

Suchman, E. A. Evaluative Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Thompson, M. Evaluation for Decision in Social Programmes. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1975.

Tyler, R. W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1950.

Tyler, R., S. Lapan, J. Moore, C. W. Rivers, and D. Skibo. "Impact of Minimum Competence Testing in Florida." Today's Education, 67 (September-October, 1978), 30-38.

Wirtz, W. On Further Examination. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1977.

Wolcott, H. F. Teachers vs. Technocrats. Eugene, OR: Center for Eudcational Policy and Management, Univ. of Oregon, 1977.

Wolf, R. L. "Trial by Jury: A New Evaluation Method." Phi Delta Kappan, 57 (November, 1975), 185-187.

Wolf, R. L. "The Use of Judicial Evaluation Methods in the Formation of Educational Policy." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1 (May-June, 1974), 19-28.

Worthen, B. R., and J. R. Sanders (eds.). Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones, 1973.

Sarah W. Freedman

Student Characteristics and Writing Performance

Most researchers concerned with the evaluation of student writing have searched for those characteristics of essays that relate to quality ratings (e.g., Hiller, Marcotte, & Martin, 1969; Nold & Freedman, 1977; Grobe, 1981) or that influence quality ratings (e.g., Harris, 1977; Freedman, 1979). By defining the type of written product that receives a high score and the type that receives a low score, we learn what students need to produce in order to achieve a high score. We learn about what to teach. However, another important set of questions focuses on what stimulates a writer to write a strong essay as opposed to a weak essay. Answers to these questions may give us clues about how to teach. In the research I will report on, I sought answers to the following questions: 1) Do students' perceptions of the difficulty level of a topic relate to the scores they will receive? 2) Do students' perceptions of the interest level of a topic relate to the scores they will receive? 3) Do students with certain attitudes receive better scores? 4) Do students with certain attributes receive better scores?

To answer these questions I devised two questionnaires, one asking students to rate the interest and difficulty levels of a set of topics and another asking them about their attitudes about writing and about some of their attributes. Then I collected essays from the students and had them rated holistically on a four-point scale. All information about the writers was concealed from the raters.

The questionnaires were completed by 167 students, all enrolled in required freshman level classes in four colleges in the San Francisco Bay Area. In all, eight classes participated, two from each school, each class taught by a different teacher. The colleges ranged in type from highly select private schools to open admission public schools. On a later date, after I analyzed the students' judgments of the interest and difficulty levels of twelve expository topics, six asking for an opinion on a current controversial issue and six asking for a comparison of two quotations, I eliminated the four topics (two of each type) about which the students felt most neutral. Then each student wrote an essay on one of the remaining eight topics.

After examining the interrelationships between the different student attributes and attitudes, I examined how the most independent writer attitudes and attributes related to the essay scores. With an analysis of variance, I determined how the students' school, age, amount of pleasure derived from writing, and amount of confidence in in-class writing performance, contributed to the variance in holistic scores. School proved to be the strongest predictor of how a student's writing was judged. The more selective the admissions standards of the school, the higher the judgments of the students' writing samples ($p < .001$). But regardless of where the students went to school, self-assessments of writing also were related to the judgments of writing quality ($p < .05$). If students claimed to perform better than their peers, they did; if they claimed to do worse, they did. The amount of pleasure the students associated with writing did not account for ratings of their writing, nor did age. A separate analysis revealed that the interest and difficulty level of the topic did not affect the scores, even though

one of the eight topics (an opinion topic) received higher ratings than the rest (Freedman, 1981).

Although certain topics can stimulate better writing than others, one cannot determine which topics will be better by examining how interesting or how difficult the students find them. It is important to continue to search for variables that contribute to the design of good topics. Woodworth & Keech (1980) found that in narrative writing audience conditions made no differences in scores. We still have much to learn about the effects of writing topics.

Interestingly, students' confidence in themselves as writers is the only attitude variable related to performance. In promoting better performance, teachers should pay more attention to students' confidence than to how pleasurable their writing experiences are (not that they should ignore this variable).

Overall, these college students saw writing as a difficult and interesting task. But their interest level varied as a direct function of the teacher. For the most part, the students come in to our classes with realistic, positive attitudes, and as teachers, we must capitalize on those attitudes and work to build the students' confidence. I suspect that we will build confidence through helping them grow as writers and have good reason to become more self-confident. Furthermore, we need to search for the variables that make some topics stimulate better writing than others.

INSTRUCTIONS
(Difficulty 2)

On the next three pages you will find the same 12 topics that you just rated. This time I would like to know which ones you find the most difficult and which you find least difficult.

1. Place a plus (+) mark in the left margin beside the four topics you find most difficult or hardest.

2. Place a minus (-) mark in the left margin beside the four topics you find least difficult or easiest.

3. Circle the number of the one topic that you find most difficult. This must be one of the four topics you have already marked with a + sign.

4. Circle the number of the one topic you find least difficult. This must be one of the four topics you have already marked with a - sign.

If you have any questions about these directions, call your teacher for help.

School_____

Instructor_____

1. Name:_____
   Last First Middle

2. Birthdate:_____
   Month Day Year

3. Sex:_____

4. Year (circle one): Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

5. Circle the appropriate number for each of the following.

   a) Do you find writing papers for school

   pleasurable 1 2 3 painful? 4

   b) Do you find writing papers for school

   difficult 1 2 3 easy? 4

   c) When you write papers for school, how do you feel about the topics you write on?

   interested 1 2 3 uninterested 4

   d) When you write in-class papers or essay exams, how would you rate your performance compared to your classmates?

   worse than most 1 2 3 better than most 4

6. If you took the SAT or ACT before entering college, what was your verbal aptitude score?_____ Your SAT English Composition score?_____

7. What are your parents' occupations?

   Father's_____

   Mother's_____

Bibliography

Grobe, C. Syntactic maturity, mechanics, and vocabulary as predictors of quality ratings. Research in the Teaching of English, 1981, 15 75-85.

Harris, W. Teacher response to student writing: A study of the response patterns of high school English teachers to determine the basis for teacher judgment of student writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 1977, 11, 175-185.

Hiller, J., Marcotte, D., & Martin, T. Opinionation, vagueness, and specificity-distinctions: Essay traits measured by computer. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 271-286.

Nold, E., & Freedman, S. An analysis of readers' responses to essays. Research in the Teaching of English, 1977, 11, 164-174.

Freedman, S. How characteristics of student essays influence teachers' evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 328-338.

Freedman, S. Influences on evaluators of expository essays: Beyond the text. Research in the Teaching of English, October, 1981, in press.

Woodworth, P., & Keech, C. The write occasion. Classroom Research Study Number 1. Berkeley: Bay Area Writing Project, 1980.

Glynda Hull
Deborah Arnowitz
William Smith

Interrupting Visual Feedback in Writing

In recent years it has become commonplace to talk about the "recursive" nature of the composing process. Several researchers (Perl, Sommers, Flower and Hayes) have pointed out that composing doesn't occur in a simple linear progression. Rather, movement forward, whether to continue text production or to begin editing or planning, occurs in conjunction with movement backwards, to read what one has written and to reflect upon one's text.

If composing is a recursive activity, it seems reasonable to expect behavioral manifestations of that recursion, behaviors like rereading one's text, or pausing, perhaps to reflect upon what one has written. And in fact, researchers have often noted such activities, and have at times correlated their occurrence with good writers. Pianko, for example, found that her traditional college writers "re-scanned" their texts three times more often than her remedial writers and concluded that the reflective activity implied by such re-scanning is the parameter which separates good and poor writers. There have been few attempts, however, to experimentally test the role of writing behaviors like re-scanning.

In order to design such a test, we have found it helpful to place the writing behavior of re-scanning and the notion of recursion in writing in the context of a comprehensive learning theory--cybernetics or negative feedback theory. Originally defined by Wiener as "control and communication in the animal and machine," cybernetics has been applied to numerous fields and disciplines, most popularly artificial intelligence. We are interested in a basic concept of cybernetics, the feedback cycle whereby one performs

an action by continuously checking one's progress. It is negative feedback--or communication of change or error--which allows one to avoid making the same mistakes indefinitely.

A feedback model of the writing process posits movement toward a desired end product through a continual interchange of writing and examining and evaluating what has been written against internal standards. Thus, based on the general notion of recursiveness in writing and the research on feedback, it might be expected that situations which interrupt feedback loops would interfere with composing. Consequently, the purpose of this research was to determine how interrupting one component of the feedback system--visual access to what one has written--affects the writing of experienced, good writers and inexperienced, poorer writers.

Eighteen subjects, 9 basic writers and 9 graduate students, wrote essays in response to two topics, both of which were designed to elicit persuasive writing. We allowed students 50 minutes for their responses to the topics, with a one-week interval between tasks. The first essay was written under "normal" conditions, and the second under the experimental condition of not being able to see what was written--subjects wrote in invisible ink. Thus, the first essay provided baseline data for comparison with the second.

We analyzed each essay using the standard global syntactic complexity measures, words per T-unit and words per clause, and a fluency measure, total number of words produced. We also analyzed the types, placement, and frequency of clauses, and we developed a taxonomy for classifying sentence level error. Last, we evaluated overall quality through holistic ratings.

Our results indicated no significant differences between tasks for

either group in words per T-unit; in clause placement, type, and frequency; or in fluency. However, both groups wrote significantly fewer words per clause and made fewer sentence level errors per T-unit when feedback was interrupted. In addition, those essays written in invisible ink received significantly lower quality ratings.

Thus, the essays produced under conditions of interrupted feedback did not differ as markedly as might have been expected on the sentence level: subjects experienced no apparent difficulty in producing well-formed, relatively error-free sentences when they could or could not see what they had written. This sentence level constancy suggests that both levels of writers have internalized a written style--an habitual syntax perhaps--which they can produce automatically in a timed writing situation. The reduction in clause length was perhaps a result of memory incapacitation. When denied recourse to what they had written subjects reacted by decreasing memory load by putting fewer words or perhaps chunks of information into the basic perceptual unit, the clause.

The reduced clause length cannot, however, be used to account for the lower holistic rating of the essays written in invisible ink. (As Faigley has shown, words per T-unit and words per clause account only for 3 percent of the total variance in holistic evaluations.) On the other hand, the fact that sentence level error per T-unit decreased for both groups when feedback was interrupted may suggest that during the second task subjects were attend- more to micro-level concerns. If this is the case, then we can explain the lower holistic ratings of the essays written when feedback was interrupted by suggesting that students lost control of their writing beyond the sentence and beyond the paragraph.

Error Analysis for Subject_____

Specify errors when necessary in the space below.

A. SPELLING — SUM

1. Capitals_____ _____
2. Apostrophes_____ _____
3. Written together_____ _____
4. Written apart_____ _____
5. Morphemic_____ _____
6. Words_____ _____
7. Other_____ _____

B. PUNCTUATION

8. Sentence boundary_____ _____
9. Question mark_____ _____
10. Semi-colon_____ _____
11. Colon_____ _____
12. Dash_____ _____
13. Quotation marks_____ _____
14. Commas-series_____ _____
15. Commas-coordinators_____ _____
16. Commas-initial_____ _____
17. Commas-medial_____ _____
18. Commas-final_____ _____
19. Commas-other_____ _____

C. OTHER

20. Verb-tense_____ _____
21. Verb-inflection_____ _____
22. Verb-agreement_____ _____
23. Pronoun-agreement_____ _____
24. Pronoun-case_____ _____
25. Voc-concatenation_____ _____

D. SYNTAX

26. Blurred patterns, etc.___ _____
27. Word order_____ _____
28. Omitted words_____ _____
29. Added words_____ _____

TOTAL _____

(Regular ink; experienced writer)

Agent Orange.

There must be something about leap years that brings out the carnival spirit in Americans. This quadrennial flower blossoms, ~~every~~ to be sure, at other irregular intervals — we're always ready to take time off to burn a President at the stake (or rather roast him lingeringly on a spit) — but blooms in its fullest glory in a leap year summer. During the election primaries and caucuses and the Winter Olympics ~~the~~ the ~~first~~ ~~city~~ Dukakis can be heard warming up in the background, but by the middle of the year the party's in full swing, with the Presidential conventions and the all-important Summer Olympics. What do all these activities have in common? They are media

(Invisible ink; experienced writer)

August Orange

I guess I just don't see what the difficulty is. Let us lay down the following maxim: if men and women have equal rights, they should share equal responsibilities. If women have the same voting rights that men have (which they do), then they should have the same responsibility to share in the defense of our nation. Likewise if they have the same rights to education, the same rights to consume alcoholic beverages, and roughly the same opportunities to seek gainful employment, then they should be subject to the draft whenever men are. (Equality of opportunity is problematic; I shall return to it in the conclusion in this essay. For now we can leave it at equal opportunity for employment in

(Regular ink; inexperienced writer) 5th

In regards to the political and athletic situations between Russia and the United States. I feel that there is absolutely no comparison. Athletes are entitled to compete and politics should be left for the government to handle.

In view of the political matter at hand, the world is in potential danger if Russia is to take over Afghanistan. The world's oil supply lies in the area of Afghanistan and ~~Russia~~ Iran. Therefore, if the United States does not intervene in this matter, Russia could end up taking over the world.

(Invisible ink; inexperienced writer)

In regards to the situation, a great deal of consideration must be taken in accord to strength, endurance, and the mobility and size of a person.

In my opinion, the draft for women is fine, but there is a problem that exists; that is, just how effective can a women be in the army? One possabilty is for women to serve as army nurses and tend to wounds (superficial).

I feel that the womens libbers should be the first to be drafted because of their equality to men. It cannot be expected for a women's libber to speak

Bibliography

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A. & Rosen, H. The development of writing abilities (11-18). London: MacMillan, 1975.

Cooper, C.R. Holistic evalution of writing. In C.R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1977.

Crowhurst, M. Syntactic complexity and teachers' quality ratings of narrations and arguments. Research in the Teaching of English, 1980, 14, 223-231.

Daiute, C.A. Psycholinguistic foundations of the writing process. Research in the Teaching of English, 1981, 15, 5-22.

Emig, J. Hand, eye, brain: Some "basics" in the writing process. In C.R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Research on composing: Points of departure. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE. 1978.

Faigley, L. Names in search of a concept: Maturity, fluency, complexity, and growth in written syntax. College Composition and Communication, 1980, 31, 292-299.

Flower, L.S., & Hayes, J.R. Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J.R. The pregnant pause: An inquiry into the nature of planning. Research in the Teaching of English, in press.

Frawley, W. Universal grammar and composition: Relativization and complementation. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1981.

Freedman, S. Influences on evaluators of expository essays: Beyond the the text. Research in the Teaching of English, in press.

Gould, J.D. Experiments on composing letters: Some facts, some myths, and some observations. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980.

Hull, G.A. Effects of self-management strategies on journal writing by college freshmen. Research in the Teaching of English, 1981, 15, 135-48.

Hurtig, R.R. Toward a functional theory of discourse. In R.O. Freddle (Ed.), Discourse production and comprehension. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1977.

Perl, S. The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.

Perron, J.D. The impact of mode on written syntactic complexity: Parts I-III--Third, fourth, and fifth grades. Studies in Language Education, Report Nos. 24, 25, & 27. Dept. of Language Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA., 1976.

Pianko, S. A description of the composing processes of college freshman writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 5-22.

San Jose, C. Grammatical structures in four modes of writing at fourth grade level. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1972.

Shaughnessy, M. Errors and expectations. New York: Oxford, 1977.

Smith, K.U. Cybernetic principles of learning and educational design. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.

Sommers, N.I. Revision in the composing process: A case study of experienced writers and student writers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1978.

Teleman, U. On visual feedback in writing. Proceedings I, Sixth International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Lund, 1981, 424-25. (Abstract)

Wiener, N. Cybernetics or control and communication in the animal and the machine. New York: John Wiley, 1948.